þÿ Bring the Artist to the Composing Room! : Tex
þÿ Aaro Hellaakoski s Concept of Book Arts

Pulkkinen, Veijo Kullervo

2015

þÿ Pulkkinen , V K 2015 , ' Bring the Artist to the Composing Room! : T
þÿ Hellaakoski s Concept of Book Arts ' , Scandinavian Studies , vol. 87

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/303231

other
acceptedVersion

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by University of Illinois Press in Scandinavian Studies on Fall 2015, available online: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/scanstud.87.3.0332?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

Veijo Pulkkinen

[Translated by Sirpa Vehviläinen]

"Bring the artist to the composing room!" Text and image in Aaro Hellaakoski's concept of book arts

When the Finnish poet Aaro Hellaakoski (1893–1952) browsed the newly published issue of the journal *Aitta* [Granary] in October 1929 to see his own series of poems *Lentoposti* [Airmail] published, he was shocked to find his text completely surrounded by illustrations (Hellaakoski 1929b, 16–7). The text had been divided on the pages of the spread in compliance with the author's wishes, so that the more humorous verses were placed on the left-hand page and the more serious ones on the right-hand page. Hellaakoski, however, had not been told anything about the series of poems being illustrated, and the illustrations been never sent to him for his approval. In a letter written for the following issue of the journal, Hellaakoski does not hide his annoyance:

> "Koristelu" sekä kokonaisuudessaan että yksityiskohdiltaan saattaa tekstinkin sellaiseen

valoon, että terveellä arvostelukyvyllä varustettu lukija kääntää sille inhoten selkänsä. Viittaan vain esim. kehys-irvistelyn viimeiseen kuvaan, jossa nähdään hirsipuu, hirtetty nainen arkussaan ynnä muuta sellaista, jota kynäni kieltäytyy mainitsemasta—kaikki kuitenkin asioita, joilla ei ole mitään aihepohjaa tekstissä.

Koristelijan harjoittama tekstin väärintulkinta on jo sinänsä skandaali. Vielä katkerampaa on tekstin tekijän nähdä joutuneensa tahtomattaan osalliseksi mitä törkeimpään naisen ja naisellisuuden solvaukseen. (Hellaakoski 1929c, 54)

("The illustration" as a whole and in detail also puts the text in such a light that any reader with a sound judgment will turn from it in disgust. I am just referring to, for example, the last image of the frame grimace, in which we see the gallows, a hanged woman in her coffin, and some other things that my pen refuses to mention—all of them yet things that are not at all based on the text.

The misinterpretation of the text by the illustrator alone is a scandal. It is even more bitter for the author to see that he, unwillingly, is involved in insulting women and femininity in a most outrageous way.)

Illustrating a text without the author's approval is certainly enough to upset the author, but we can understand Hellaakoski's strong reaction even better if we know that he opposed the illustration of literary works particularly strongly. Even though the editorial staff of *Aitta* were clearly not aware of Hellaakoski's opinion, it was no secret. Since 1917 Hellaakoski had published polemic commentaries, book reviews, and a couple of general essays, in which he

principally discusses the decoration of books with the means of illustration and typography.[1] These writings convey an in-depth aesthetic view on the relationship between literary text, illustration, and typography.

These texts on book arts have not previously been considered in depth in the research on Hellaakoski.[2] Therefore, Hellaakoski's negative attitude toward the illustration of literary works may come as a surprise to contemporary readers as well. Hellaakoski was actually known for his great interest in the visual arts. He wrote art criticism and published several essays on painting and sculpture. He was also an amateur painter himself, even though he did not want to expose his hobby to the public.

Hellaakoski's writings on book arts are particularly important from the point of view of his modernistic poetry collection *Jääpeili* (1928) [Ice Mirror]. The experimental typography and other such avant-gardist devices used in this work makes it a pioneer of modernist poetry written in Finnish. Finland had to wait until the 1960s for a corresponding experimental approach. Hellaakoski never explained the experimental typography of *Jääpeili* in more than a couple of sentences. His writings on book arts are therefore highly significant in illuminating his ideas on typography and the relationship between images and words.

Hellaakoski's strict view on the relationship between images and words seems, at first, to be contradictory, taking into account the fact that he himself wrote visual poetry. However, after a closer look, this impression proves to be wrong. I will demonstrate in this article that

---

[1] In Hellaakoski's articles, "koristelu" [decoration] refers especially to the embellishment of books with ornaments, illustrations, etc. Decoration is not precisely synonymous with book design since books are often not decorated. Hellaakoski stresses that a book can be beautiful without accessory decoration if the basic elements of book design, such as the typefaces, layout, paper, binding, etc. are used with good taste.

[2] In his article on Dada in Finland, Nikolai Sadik-Ogli briefly mentions Hellaakoski's essay "Kirjojen ulkoasusta ja koristamisesta" (1923) [On the appearance and decoration of books] and his demand that typography gain more attention in book design. Sadik-Ogli also notes that Hellaakoski's actual experiments with typography were rather tame and limited (Sadik-Ogli 2000, 44). Anna Perälä has also remarked on Hellaakoski's negative take on illustration in her article on illustration in Finnish nineteenth-century books (Perälä 2014, 18).

Hellaakoski's writings on book arts actually provide a basis for analyzing the typographic poetics of *Jääpeili*. First I will focus on the author's antimimetic aesthetics and on his idea of illustration as "violence against text" and the reader's free imagination. Later in the article, I will clarify the role of "purity of form" in Hellaakoski's approach to book arts and in his more general aesthetic thinking. Lastly I will examine how this aesthetic of the purity of form is applied in practice in the experimental typography of *Jääpeili*.

The violence of illustration

Hellaakoski's attitude toward the illustration of literary works is best portrayed in the essay "Kirjojen ulkoasusta ja koristamisesta." In it he addresses the relationship of text, image, and typography in book arts at an almost theoretical level. Hellaakoski also rather consistently repeats the ideas formed in the essay in his book reviews written on illustrated "deluxe" editions and in his polemics on book design. The significance of the essay for his concept of literature is also demonstrated by the fact that Hellaakoski included it in his essay collection *Kuuntelua: esseitä teoksista ja tekijöistä* (1950) [Listening: essays on works and authors]. We might actually regard the essay "Kirjojen ulkoasusta ja koristamisesta" as Hellaakoski's typographic manifesto.

In his essay Hellaakoski examines book arts primarily from the perspective of the reader: he evaluates illustration, typography, binding, and so on, in terms of text readability. Hellaakoski is able to appreciate a book as an artistic whole of its own, but he finds that the success of a book's design depends on how much it facilitates or complicates the reader's concentration on the text. According to Hellaakoski, the appearance of a book is by no means unimportant—on the

contrary, it is an extremely important feature, as it has the potential to seriously harm the reading experience. Hellaakoski finds that the illustration of literary works violates both the text and the reader. He maintains that the illustrator always adds a personal touch to the text, and that the illustration is the illustrator's interpretation of the text—not the interpretation of the author. The author and the illustrator are usually not the same person, and the author may not even be given an opportunity to influence the illustration process. This is what Hellaakoski himself bitterly experienced with his poetry series, *Lentoposti*. He finds that there is a fundamental conflict between image and text:

> Kuvitetussa kirjassa vedetään kuva-aistimukset etualalle, vieläpä sillä poikkeuksellisella mahdilla, joka kuvaamataiteilijalla on. – Eihän tämä voi olla millään muotoa tekstin tehostamista tai kaunistamista. Kuvitus voi itsessään olla kaunis, mutta kirjaan yhdistettynä se on törkeän väkivaltainen, väkivaltainen ennenkaikkea lukijaa kohtaan, joka, kuvien ylivoiman sysimänä, ehdottomasti kadottaa herkimmät kosketuksensa tekstiin. Ja väkivaltainen on kuvitus tietysti myöskin itse tekstille; senhän näkee selvimmin siitä että jokainen eri kuvittaja näkee samassa tekstissä aivan erilaisia kuvia – siis he tulkitsevat tekstiin liittyviä kuva-aistimuksia väärin, tulkitsevat niitä todesti itselleen, mutta valehdellen muille. Etenkin sellainen lukija, jolla itsellään on elävät sisäiset kuvanäyt, voi raivostua kuvitetun kirjan ääressä, joka silpoo hänen mielikuvituksensa kappaleiksi voimatta tarjota tilalle muuta kuin panoraaman tai filmin, jossa teksti ei enää elä, vaan selittää kuvia.… Kuvat siis voivat joiltakin lukijoilta kokonaan tuhota tekstin tai ainakin tappavat intuition, sen ainoan keinon, jolla teksti voidaan omistaa. (Hellaakoski 1923a)

(In an illustrated book, visual sensations are foregrounded—even with the exceptional power of the visual artist. It's clear that this can in no way enhance or embellish the text. The illustration as such can be beautiful, but if integrated with a book, it is outrageously violent, violent above all to the readers who, shoved by the predominance of images, unquestionably lose their own intimate encounter with the text. Of course, the illustration is also violent to the text itself; this is best shown by the fact that every illustrator sees completely different images in the same text—in other words, they misinterpret the visual sensations associated with the text, interpreting them truthfully to themselves but untruthfully to the others. Particularly readers who have a vivid imagination may lose their temper when faced with an illustrated book that disrupts their imagination and cannot offer in compensation anything other than a panorama or film, in which the text is not alive anymore, it only explains the images.… Images can thus completely destroy the text for some readers, or at least they kill their intuition, the only means of owning the text.)

The illustration constitutes the illustrator's more-or-less true interpretation of a text. It is one limited interpretation of the things described in the text. All interpretations are naturally individual and limited, irrespective of whether they are produced by illustrators or readers themselves. Even if we saw the illustrator's interpretation just as one interpretation among many, it does have a special role as part of the book's illustration, because it highlights and emphasizes a specific interpretation strategy among various potential interpretations. It depends on the readers' will and abilities whether they can create an independent interpretation or whether they

will surrender to the influences of the illustration. Can an illustrated text actually ever be read neutrally? Even consciously ignoring illustration affects our reading experience, let alone the attempt to interpret the text in a way that differs from that of the illustrator.

According to Hellaakoski, the core of the matter is not so much the fact that illustration is only one limited interpretation of a text, but that it is specifically an interpretation presented in visual form. Hellaakoski is not at all against literary themes in the visual arts—the problem lies in integrating the visual and the literary arts. Illustration disturbs the reading experience, in which the textual world is imagined in our conscience. Compared to the reading experience, interpretation is a more analytical, multiphase process that takes place after reading. In it, we can analyze what has influenced the production of the meaning and create links between works in different fields of art and cultural texts. The reading experience that takes place before the interpretation process is a much more subtle and intimate process, which according to Hellaakoski is easily influenced by external distractions.

Hellaakoski's strong objection to illustration was probably unusual already in his own time, in which a steadily increasing number of images were seen in books and journals as well as in the urban landscape. For instance, Hellaakoski's contemporary Olavi Paavolainen (1903–1964), the spiritual leader of the literary group Tulenkantajat [The Torch Bearers], had the entirely opposite attitude toward the relationship between image and word. Paavolainen designed the illustrations for his own essays and worked as a copywriter at an advertising agency. An example of Paavolainen's illustrated works is the modernistic collection *Valtatiet* (1928) [Highways], which he created under the pseudonym Olavi Lauri together with Mika Waltari (1908–1979), another member of the Tulenkantajat, who is better known for his novels. The

cover and the title page of each section in the book are drawn by the artist Sylvi Kunnas (1903–1971).

Today the relationship between text and image is analyzed as different intermedial means of interaction rather than as negative distraction. A purist separation of text and image is seen as utopian because the meanings of images often need to be explained with words; texts, on the other hand, can be very picturesque. Letters and text are as such types of graphic images (Mitchell 1994, 94–9; Mikkonen 2005, 21–4, 55–7). What is interesting in Hellaakoski's view is that he is fully aware of the visual features of text. Hellaakoski disapproves of illustrating books precisely because, in the interplay between image and word, the image excessively highlights the visual nature of the text, and the other senses receive less attention. Even though the purpose of a picture is to serve the text, because its topics and meanings are based on the text, it needs explication. Understanding a picture as part of a text requires that the text explain it. This distorts the original function of text, and the text risks becoming merely a caption (Hellaakoski 1920).

In Hellaakoski's arguments against illustration, we can see an ethical aspect connected to the ontological character of literary works. Hellaakoski apparently emphasizes the intimacy and vulnerability of the reading experience precisely because the world of a literary work is imagined therein. In other words, a literary work exists only when it is read. The illustrator, with his or her personal mental images and interpretations, penetrates this intimate relationship between the reader and the work—the only space in which a literary work can exist. We are thus dealing with ethics, the work's right to exist autonomously and to be expressed by its own means. At the same time, we are dealing with the reader's right to a reading experience, in the way the work is intended to be read.

In some respects, Hellaakoski's ideas about the relationship between image and text bear a resemblance to Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's aesthetics. The theory Lessing presented in his work *Laocoon: An Essay upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry* (1766) has essentially influenced the concepts of Western art philosophy on the relationship between text and image. In his work Lessing suggests that poetry is a temporal art and painting is a spatial art. According to the earlier "ut pictura poesis" aesthetics of Quintus Horatius Flaccus, good poetry was picturesque and, on the other hand, one should aim at poetic expression in the visual arts. The various art forms were thus seen as able to portray the same things. Lessing questioned the common mimetic basis of the art forms by distinguishing between painting and poetry based on their temporal qualities. Paintings can portray only one moment, whereas literary narration is constituted by the relationships between the past, the present, and the future (Lessing 1887, 91–2; Mikkonen 2005, 96–8, 108–9).

In his earliest writing on book arts, "Kalevalaa kuvittamaanko?" [Should the Kalevala be illustrated?] from 1917, Hellaakoski provides reasons for the impossibility of book illustration in words very similar to Lessing's and claims that the media of literature and the visual arts are incommensurate:

> Mutta ajatus runoteoksen kuvittamisesta on mahdollinen ainoastaan jos ei olla selvillä runous- ja kuvaamataiteitten suhteesta toisiinsa. Oikeastaan ovat nämä taiteet niin kokonaan eriluontoisia että niitten vertaaminenkin on jo melkein mahdotonta, saati sitten yhteensovittaminen. Kirjallisuutta ei voida korvata eikä edes selittää kuvaamataiteitten avulla eikä päinvastoin. (Hellaakoski 1917a, 35)

(But the idea of illustrating a poetic work is possible only if we are not aware of the relationship between poetry and the visual arts. In effect, the nature of these art forms is so totally different that even comparing them is nearly impossible, let alone matching them. Literature can neither be replaced nor explained by the visual arts, and vice versa.)

Lessing's influence is visible in Hellaakoski's view on book arts particularly in the way in which he emphasizes the role of imagination in the reading experience. The fictive and abstract nature of literature was associated with imagination and creativity exactly due to Lessing's theory. Lessing mentions the representation of agony in the *Laocoon* sculpture as an example of imagination playing a more significant role in literature than in sculpture. The sculpture, according to Lessing, is not capable of portraying Laocoon's agony as effectively as it is done in literature, because the conventions of sculpture would not have allowed the author to represent a real cry of agony, which would have distorted the face and made it look ugly. In text, the description of agony can be left for the reader's imagination, which draws on personal experiences of pain (Lessing 1887, 33–41; Mikkonen 2005, 106–9).

The vulnerability of text and the reader's imagination exposes them to abuse. Illustration can be used to promote political, religious, and other ideological goals. The context (for example, a newspaper endorsing a political party) in which a text is published may affect its interpretation. Illustration and typography can also be utilized in trying to guide the reader's interpretation in a certain direction (see e.g. Bornstein 1998, 236–40; Kelen 2001; Jankeviciute and Vaicekauskas 2013). In his article "Kalevalaa kuvittamaanko?", Hellaakoski pays attention to the political and ideological ends that can be identified behind the illustrantions. The article addresses the illustration project of the *Suur-Kalevala* [The Great Kalevala], for which artist Akseli Gallen-

Kallela (1865–1931) had presented a plan in the magazine *Valvoja* [The Watcher] as early as in 1909 (Gallen-Kallela 1909). The article, in which Hellaakoski criticizes the political motive and execution of the project as well as questions the overall meaningfulness of illustration, provoked a polemical response after its publication in the student magazine *Ylioppilaslehti* [The Baccalaureate Magazine]:

> Yksi epäonnistumisen syy toisten ehkä painavampien joukossa on se, ettei yhden miehen näkemys voisi käsittää Kalevalan mielikuvitusmaailmasta muuta kuin pienen, kuvittajalle ja hänen kanssaan samoin ajatteleville yksilöille ominaisen, murto-osan. Kuvittaja sulkisi siis muitten lukijain mielikuvituksen ahtaaseen aitaukseen, jossa olisi ehkä vain matala kumpu vuoren asemasta ja lähteensilmä järven sijalla.—Jos kuvittaja taasen olisi useampi, kävisi sangen vaikeaksi, jollei mahdottomaksi, saada mitään yhteistä tyyliä teokseen. Pelättävää on näinollen että kyseenalainen kuvittaminen tulisi olemaan jonkinlainen pyhyydenhäväistys. Kalevala vedettäisiin alas taideteoksen arvostaan uhraamalla se joittenkin aatteitten tulkiksi ja palvelijaksi. Toisekseen vedettäisiin se vielä alas kansalliseepoksen arvostaankin yksityisen taiteilijan tulkiksi. Ja tämän kaiken täytyy olla vastenmielistä, vieläpä rikollistakin, niitten mielestä, jotka Kalevalaa *lukevat*, olkootpa nuo mainitut aatteet itse asiassa hyviäkin ja taiteilija kunnollinen. Yhtä vastenmielistä pitäisi kuvittamisen olla niittenkin mielestä, jotka Kalevalaa edes hitusen kunnioittavat, vaikkeivat he koulusta päästyään olisi sitä avanneetkaan.… Jokatapauksessa olisivat kuvitus ja teksti ristiriidassa keskenään. Eivätkä ne olisi kansallistakaan samassa merkityksessä. Teksti olisi kansallista sentakia että se on *kansanomaista*, itsetiedottomasti kuvastaen juuri Suomen maata ja kansaa. Mutta kuvitus tulisi olemaan itsetietoisesti,

tarkoitetusti, aatteellisesti kansallista. Teksti olisi täysipainoista taidetta, kuvitus luultavimmin ei. (Hellaakoski 1917a, 35)

One reason for failure among others, maybe more serious ones, is that one man's vision could not cover more than a small fraction of the imaginary world of the *Kalevala*—a vision typical of the illustrator and those who think like him. The illustrator would thus cage other readers' imagination so that the text might portray only a flat hillock instead of a mountain and a spring instead of a lake.—On the other hand, if there were several illustrators, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to ensure a consistency of style in the work. Therefore, this questionable illustration attempt would risk being some sort of a sacrilege. The value of the *Kalevala* as an artwork would be reduced by sacrificing it to interpret and serve certain ideologies. In addition, its value as Finland's national epic would be reduced if it were to interpret an individual artist's vision. All of this must be offensive, even criminal, according to those who *read* the *Kalevala*, even if the aforementioned ideologies were actually good as well as the artist respectable. Illustrating the *Kalevala* should seem equally repellent to those who respect the *Kalevala* at least a bit even if they may not have opened it finishing their formal education.… In any case, the illustration and the text would contradict each other. Furthermore, they would not be national in the same sense. The text would be national because it is *vernacular*, unintentionally reflecting exactly Finland as a country and the Finnish nation. But the illustration would be consciously, intentionally and ideologically national. The text would be proper art, the illustration most probably not.)

Hellaakoski's critical writing did not arouse the desired aesthetic debate on the potential of book arts, the most rational way of implementing the project, and on whether it is meaningful or even possible at all to illustrate a literary work. On the contrary, it was claimed that illustrating the *Kalevala* was self-evidently a nationally crucial initiative, and that Gallen-Kallela was its "itseoikeutettu ja ainoa kuvittaja" (Lauri H–én 1917, 47) [undeniable and sole illustrator]. This provoked Hellaakoski to list numerous reasons why Gallen-Kallela was not a suitable option. Hellaakoski saw the project as having originally been the artist's personal project, which was now being financed by the people, using patriotism as an excuse (Hellaakoski 1917b, 60; 1917c). The *Suur-Kalevala* was never finished, but after the so-called *Koru-Kalevala* [Illustrated Kalevala] was published in 1922, Hellaakoski even praised Gallen-Kallela's book design (Hellaakoski 1923b; 1924a). A book could thus also be illustrated in a way that satisfied Hellaakoski.

Antimimesis

Hellaakoski's attitude toward illustrating literary works was thus not quite as uncompromising as we could assume based on the essay "Kirjojen ulkoasusta ja koristamisesta". Hellaakoski even illustrated texts himself. However, these illustrations were exclusively cover pictures he made for the two volumes of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *Faust* he owned (Tiusanen 1977, 50). Some images are also included in Hellaakoski's own texts, as many of his short stories were originally illustrated when they were published in different magazines and annuals. Hellaakoski re-published some of the short stories later, unillustrated, in the collection *Iloinen yllätys* (1927)

[Pleasant Surprise]. Perhaps he did not take his short stories seriously enough to think that their illustration disturbs his or the readers' imaginations. Hellaakoski's reviews of illustrated editions, however, reveal the view that texts could also be illustrated in a more or less tolerable way.

The most repulsive thing that Hellaakoski could imagine happening to a book was illustrating it "Realistically" or "Naturalistically", which is highlighted already in his critique of the *Kalevala* illustration project:

> Tälläkertaa ei vielä ole julkisuudessa mainittu mihin suuntaan kuvittaminen tapahtuisi. Mutta, muistellen varempia suunnitelmia, ei voi tulla muuhun johtopäätökseen kuin että siitä tehtäisiin selittävä, samallakertaa sekä *kertova* että *kansatieteellisesti* tarkka. Tahdottaisi saada kuvitus kansalliseksi ehkä—arkeologian avulla.—Sentapaiset tuumat ovat muuten erikoisesti kuvaavia niille arkeologis-historiallis-filologis-kansallisille piireille, jotka ovat asian julkisia alkuunpanijoita.
>
> Ei ole ensinkään otettu huomioon, voidaanko Kalevalaa edes tähäntapaan kuvittaa. Eihän ole kysymys mistään realistisesta novellista tai romaanista, jonka saattaisi kertovasti kuvittaa, yhtävähän kuin historian oppikirjastakaan, joka selityskuvia kaipaisi. Kertovaan tapaan ei kuvitusta voida tyydyttävästi suorittaa. Ja kansatieteellisten kuvien paikka on taasen tieteellisessä selitysniteessä, valokuvien joukossa. (Hellaakoski 1917a, 35)

(Up until now, it has not yet been mentioned publicly in what direction the illustration project would go. But, when thinking of the earlier plans, we cannot draw any other conclusion other than that it will be explanatory, at the same time both *narratively* and

ethnologically exact. They might want to create a national illustration, perhaps—with the help of archaeology.—These types of thoughts, by the way, are particularly typical of the archaeological-historical-philological-national circles that have publicly launched the project.

It has not been considered at all whether or not the Kalevala could be illustrated in this way. It is not a Realistic short story or novel, which could be narratively illustrated. Neither is it a history textbook that requires pictures to explain the text. It cannot be properly illustrated in a narrative manner. Additionally, ethnological images belong in scientific publications, among the photographs.)

The author's opposition to Realistic and Naturalistic illustration is to a large extent explained by his Expressionist background. Hellaakoski himself had said that particularly the paintings of T. K. Sallinen (1879–1955), a member of the Expressionist Marraskuu [November] group, had at an early stage strongly influenced him (Hellaakoski 1964, 29). Hellaakoski also published a study on Sallinen's art (Hellaakoski 1921b). He had additional links to the Marraskuu group through another of its members, sculptor Wäinö Aaltonen (1894–1966), who was his friend and since 1924 also his brother-in-law. Hellaakoski's early production since his first collection *Runoja* (1916) [Poems] is regarded as an essential part of Finnish expressionist verse of the 1910s and 1920s. In his poetic manifesto "Conceptio artis," Hellaakoski avows himself as an expressionist, choosing to use shouting as the lyric tone instead of decorative language. The same radical and defiantly confident fidelity to his own voice is manifested in Hellaakoski's poetry as the breaking of conventions and use of even vulgar vernacular and primitive forms of poetry (Lassila 1987, 75–83).

In his essay on early 1900s French painting “Kubismista klassisismiin” (1925) [From Cubism to Classicism], Hellaakoski presents expressionism as a turning point in modern art. Expressionists focused on expressing inner emotions through art instead of the physical reality. Simultaneously, at the turn of the century, expressionism put an end to a trend that had been prevalent in French art for approximately half a century, in which the coloristic principle occupied an increasing role in the structure of painting. The guiding principle of painting shifted from the use of colors to form-related features. According to Hellaakoski, form became the main interest in expressionist painting, and it was dominant also in cubism, futurism, and Dadaism. It is indeed characteristic that Hellaakoski calls cubism “French expressionism” and futurism “Italian expressionism” (Hellaakoski 1925, 61, 63–4, 68, 70, 74).

From a semiotic perspective, Expressionism is an antimimetic turning point. An Expressionist painting is no longer an icon that imitates the external world but has become an index of the artist’s emotions. An index is a symbol whose relationship to the object it represents is based on temporal and spatial continuity, such as the causality of fire and smoke (Liszka 1996, 38–9). The form of an Expressionist painting thus primarily refers to the author’s creation act and the experience on which it is based, as well as to its birth history as an object—and only secondarily to the topic portrayed in the painting. From this perspective, it is understandable that Hellaakoski preferred Expressionism to Realism in book illustration. The object of Realistic or Naturalistic illustration is the world described in the text, whereas in Expressionism the illustration represents the illustrator’s emotional experience, which is presumably based on the text. In Expressionist illustration the relationship between images and words has been distanced and therefore does not distort the reader’s reading experience.

It is not particularly surprising that the 1923 edition of *Nummisuutarit* (first edition 1864) [*The Heath Cobblers*, 1992] by Finland's national writer Aleksis Kivi (1834–1872), which was designed by caricaturist, illustrator, and book artist Toivo Vikstedt (1891–1930), received quite a laudatory review from Hellaakoski: Vikstedt's illustration has been characterized as very expressionist (Smolander 1971, 47, 51, 56, 58–9). In 1927 the book was acknowledged internationally at the Leipzig book exhibition (Smolander 1971, 49; 1974). Vikstedt was closely connected to *Jääpeili*, because Otava Publishing Company, which published the work in the late 1920s, hired him to implement the graphic layout of the company's publications. So he also designed the cover of *Jääpeili*. Hellaakoski (1923b) found that *Nummisuutarit,* also designed by Vikstedt, was "paras mitä meillä toistaiseksi on nähty" [the best thing we have so far seen] in Finnish book arts:

> Kuvien asettelu sivuille on kyllä suoritettu taitavasti, pyrkien (vaikkei aina onnistuen) sekä säilyttämään sivuaukeain värien tasapainosuhteet että itse kuvien piirrännässä välttämään häiritsevää naturalismia. Mutta taiteilija Vikstedtiltä puuttuu draamallinen verenkäynti. Hänessä ei ole "Nummisuutarien" kirjoittajan sielullista rytmiä. Siten hänen kuvituksensa, niin huolellisesti kuin se onkin sovitettu teoksen tapahtuma-ajan ja -paikan ulkonaisiin vaatimuksiin, pysyy erillään sen sielullisesta pohjasta.
>
> Jos nyt kuvittaja olisi naturalisti tai omassa laadussaan korkeajännityksen mies, olisi tarjolla se vaara, että kuvitus turmelisi muuten kyllä ulkoasultaan taidokkaasti ja mielikuvitusrikkaasti sommitellun teoksen. Mutta Vikstedt on vaatimaton ja tahdikas mies. Ei hän pyrikään tuomaan omaa ääntänsä kuuluville, piirteleehän vain pieniä hupaisia piirrelmiään, täydellä kunnioituksella Kiven tekstiä kohtaan.

(The pictures have certainly been skillfully placed on the pages, trying (even though not always succeeding) to maintain the balance of colors on the spreads as well as trying to avoid distracting naturalism in drawing the pictures themselves. But the artist Vikstedt is lacking dramatic turmoil. He does not possess the spiritual rhythm of the author of *Nummisuutarit*. That is why the illustration, irrespective of how carefully it has been adapted to the external requirements of the work's time and place, remains apart from the work's spiritual foundation.

If the illustrator here were a naturalist or a risk-taker, the illustration could ruin the work whose appearance is otherwise skillfully and fantastically designed. But Vikstedt is a modest and tactful man. He does not even try to make his own voice heard; he just keeps drawing his small, funny drawings, with full respect for Kivi's text.)

Hellaakoski maintains that book illustrations should not be too eye-catching. They must not attract the reader's attention away from the text itself. Furthermore, the illustrations must not be too closely connected to the content of the text. In other words, it is better if the illustrator does not try to represent the textual events iconically. Images should rather be independent works inspired by the book, but even so, they must not be too impressive. The connection to the text must be loose and allusive. The images must not realistically imitate an existing or imaginary object. Illustration should leave space for imagination rather than give it a ready-made picture of the events.

According to Hellaakoski, painter and graphic artist Kalle Carlstedt (1891–1952) succeeded in meeting the aforementioned requirements in illustrating the poet Eino Leino's

(1878–1926) collection *Helkavirsiä* in 1924 (the first part was originally published in 1903, the second part in 1916) [*Whitsongs*, 1978]. Carlstedt interacted closely with the aforementioned Marraskuu group, and his early woodcut style has been characterized as expressionistic by Marketta Mäkinen. In the 1920s he adopted a national style inspired by Gallen-Kallela, which is also represented in the illustration of *Helkavirsiä* (Mäkinen 1995, 92–3, 121). Carlstedt's design in *Helkavirsiä* was praised by Hellaakoski as a new top achievement in Finnish book arts. It is also particularly significant for the typography of *Jääpeili*. The edition of *Helkavirsiä* designed by Carlstedt was namely typeset using the same Fraktur typeface of the Monotype Company as the last section of *Jääpeili*. This *Helkavirsiä* edition includes over a hundred woodcuts printed by Carlstedt in black and brick red, which Hellaakoski regards as a successful artistic whole per se. The strongly stylized images have been printed with the original blocks of wood carved by the artist, which is why this edition of *Helkavirsiä* can be seen as Carlstedt's graphics portfolio, as Hellaakoski notes in the following:

> Nyt puheenaolevan korupainoksen ansiot kirjana ovat siinä, että sen naturalismista vapaat koristeelliset kuvat eivät häiritse tekstiä, ja ennenkaikkea siinä, että teoksen painoasu on hieno sekä puhtaasti typografisin keinoin aikaansaatu.
>
> - -
>
> Jos kirjaa selailee vain Kalle C.-salkkuna, on se kuin kokonainen yksityisnäyttely, sillä ikävällä rajoituksella vain, että hänen huumorinsa on siitä jokseenkin tarkkaan poissa. Mutta hänen koristeellinen mielikuvituksensa ja pitkälle kehitetty puupiirrostekniikkansa riittävät kyllä nekin mielenkiintoa ruokkimaan, varmasti hämmästyttämäänkin niitä, jotka hänen lahjojaan eivät ole tunteneet. (Hellaakoski 1924b)

(The merits of this deluxe edition as a book lie in the fact that its decorative images, free of Naturalism, do not disturb the text and, above all, in the fact that the layout is fine and accomplished through purely typographic means.

- -

If you browse the book merely as Kalle Carlstedt's portfolio, it seems like a complete individual exhibition, except for the unpleasant limitation that his humor is quite completely lacking. But his ornamental imagination and highly developed woodcut technique are as such enough to feed your interest, certainly even to surprise those who have not been familiar with his talents.)

Hellaakoski gave a different verdict to the illustrated edition of *Suomen kansan satuja ja tarinoita* (1920) [Fairy Tales and Stories of the Finnish People] issued by the publishing company Kirja. The book had been edited by Eero Salmelainen and originally published in 1852–1866. In his review, Hellaakoski criticizes the book design for "taiteellisen aistin puutteesta" [lacking an artistic sense]. "On tahdottu tekemällä tehdä kirja ulkoasultaan 'korukirjaksi, taideteokseksi'. Ei ole kuitenkaan tyydytty yksinomaan korupainokseen tavallisessa merkityksessä, vaan kirja on *kuvitettu*" (Hellaakoski 1920) [They have factitiously wanted to create a book with 'a decorative layout, an artwork'. However, they have not settled for an edition decorated in the usual sense but have *illustrated* the book]. Hellaakoski found that the main problem with this edition was a too heterogeneous group of illustrators, which is why the illustrations were disharmonious in style and quality:

> Siis madollisimman kirjava joukko, joka edustaa mitä erilaisimpia tyylipyrkimyksiä naturalismista aina nykyaikaisen ornamenttimaista yksinkertaisuutta tavoittelevaan koristeellisuuteen. Onpa mukana sellaisiakin nimiä, jotka eivät edusta mitään tyyliä, koska heillä ei vielä sitä ole. (Ibid.)
>
> (Altogether, a most colorful group that represents most diverse stylistic endeavors—from Naturalism to decorativeness that courts modern, ornamental simplicity. Even some names are included that do not represent any style, because they have none yet.)

A typical example of Hellaakoski's book arts taste is that according to him the illustrator of the fairy tale "Puhuvat kuuset" [Talking Spruces] in *Suomen kansan satuja ja tarinoita* succeeded best. Hellaakoski suspected that the illustrator was graphic artist Kosti Meriläinen (1886–1938), who was also linked to the Marraskuu group. In the images of this fairy tale, the artist used only black and white, which integrates the images into the typesetting. The colored pictures, instead, are the worst of all, and should in Hellaakoski's judgment have been left out completely. This clearly represents Hellaakoski's antimimetic aesthetics. The more the images serve as abstract ornaments resembling typographic decorations, the more probable it is that they satisfy Hellaakoski. The illustration of a book is thus optimal when it is close to purely symbolic representation, similar to language.

Disharmony disturbed Hellaakoski also more generally in the layout of Finnish books. He continually complained that publishing houses did not trust typesetters' abilities to design book covers but ordered them from artists. When artists and typesetters do their work independently, without knowing anything about each other, "Syntyy merkillisiä sekasikiöitä, joitten

puolustuksena on vain se että niihin on niin totuttu, ettei osata kaivata parempaa. Se on tehdastyötä, joka on piilotettu puleerattuun koteloon" (Hellaakoski 1923a) [weird mongrels are born, whose only defense is that people are so used to them that they cannot expect anything better. It is factory work that has been hidden in a polished case]. In his article "Kirjojen kansilehdistä" [About Book Covers] issued in the *Aika* [Time] journal in 1921, Hellaakoski also criticizes the inconsistent layout of books, which can be rather considerable even among the books of the same publisher. Hellaakoski offers a slightly suspicious solution to this issue:

> Suomalaisille kirjoille olisi saatava jonkinlainen pysyvä normaaliasu, jos ei läpeensä kaikille, niin ainakin jokaisen kustantajan tuotteille erikseen. Kirjat olisivat joko kaikki samaa "sarjaa" tai olisi kaikilla ikäänkuin yhteinen kehys, joka ei silti estäisi ahtaampien ryhmitysten, vielä eri kirjailijainkin teosten, saamasta määrättyä erikoissävyä.… Samalla kuin normaaliasu määrättäisiin— aina nimisivua (kustantajien käyttämät rumat ornamentit pois!) ja muutenkin painoasua myöten, voitaisiin ehkä myöskin määrätä kirjoille normaalikoko tai ainakin normaalisuhteet.… Ja mittasuhteiltaan on nykyinen tavallinen kirjamuoto korkeuteensa nähden liian kapea, ja sentakia ruma. (Hellaakoski 1921a, 102)
>
> (Some sort of a permanent standard layout should be established for Finnish books; if not for all of them, at least separately for the products of each publisher. The books would all be either in the same "series", or all of them would somehow have a common framework, which would still not prevent narrower groupings, even the works of different writers, from getting a specific personal tone.… At the same time, upon defining the standard

> layout—also for the title page (leaving out the ugly ornaments used by publishing houses!) and the rest of typography, we could perhaps also determine a standard size or at least standard proportions for books.… The proportions of the currently common book form are ugly: too narrow in relation to the height of the book.)

Even though Hellaakoski did not propose the "normalization" of book layout anywhere else, it is characteristic of his book arts thinking. Normalization implies standardization and creation of conventions. In a way Hellaakoski proposes that book layout should be developed into a symbolic system similar to writing, based on conventional signs. It could be used to subordinate images to book text and minimize the disturbance caused by images, which results from their character as mimetic signs.

Using purely typographic means

In the same way as various international representatives of visual poetry, Hellaakoski reacted to the development of the art of printing that took place in the 1800s and essentially changed the relationships between image, text, and typography.[3] With traditional letterpress printing, illustrations were made with print plates cut in wood, and their manual manufacture was laborious and expensive. In Finland, the print plates often had to be ordered from abroad because of a shortage of skilled workers. Therefore, generic themes that were not too clearly bound to a specific text were preferred in illustration, as they could be used and re-used in various contexts.

[3] On the influence of the development of printing technology in the 1800s on the visual poetry of such writers as Stéphane Mallarmé, F. T. Marinetti, Guillaume Apollinaire, and Russian Futurists, see e.g. Bassy (1973–1974, 163–165); Cundy (1981); Kasinec and Davis (1989); Lapacherie (1994); Goddard (2006, 298–99); Drucker (2009).

The role of images was secondary in relation to the text: their purpose was to decorate rather than elucidate the text. The layout of printed products in the letterpress era complied with book typography. Irrespective of whether for an advertisement, poster, newspaper, or magazine, the starting point for graphic design was the text composition (Jäntti 1940, 397–8, 449; Pajatti 1942, 93–4; Honkanen 1983, 15, 20–1; Kuusela 2004, 11).

In Finland the first step toward changing the interrelationship of image, text, and typography was taken in the 1840s, as lithography was introduced. Lithography is a chemical process that transfers the copied image to the surface of a stone print plate. A crucial turning point came in 1891, when Ferdinand Tilgmann (1832–1911) founded Finland's first chemigraphic facility. Photomechanical chemigraphy enabled the quick manufacture of print plates of drawings, paintings, and photographs (Jäntti 1940, 397–8, 401, 450; Pajatti 1942, 94–7; Kuusela 2004, 11–3). The new technology not only facilitated the illustration of printed products but also affected the division of tasks within the graphic industry. In the letterpress era, the printing house staff had been in charge of the design of books and their illustration with ready-made print plates. Now the illustration could be ordered from artists, who could do the work even at home. The gap between layout design and its execution through printing technology grew even wider with the establishment of a new profession of illustrator-industrial graphic designers, who mainly worked for advertisers. They designed the layout of printed products but left its execution for the printing house staff. Simultaneously, the idea of a book as a holistic artwork, which was promoted, above all, by William Morris's Arts and Crafts movement, became more popular. In Finland the first books illustrated and designed by artists were issued in the 1870s. They include such works as Johan Ludvig Runeberg's (1804–1877) *Julqvällen* (1876), [Christmas Eve], illustrated by Albert Edelfeldt (1854–1905), and Runeberg's *Hanna* (1879), illustrated by Johan

Jacob Ahrenberg (1847–1914). The print plates for their illustrations still had to be ordered from abroad (Jäntti 1940, 449–50; Kuusela 2004, 13–5, 17).

The advances in printing technology considerably changed the appearance of printed products, because illustrations could now be implemented using various technologies and because they became more frequent. The change was most visible in advertisements and posters, but it also affected the appearance of text in printed products. In the letterpress era, text had been typeset using ready-made typefaces and embellished with ready-cast typographic decorations. Lithography liberated text, decoration, and illustration from the restrictions of letterpress printing, enabling printing by hand and even drawing directly on the print plate. The typefaces designed for letterpress printing soon also started to imitate the fanciful, extravagantly ornamental letter forms produced with lithography. The typesetting of text was also influenced by the lithographic style, which highlighted decoration and image. The title pages of books, which are regarded as the typesetter's artistically most demanding task, are in this respect revealing. Title page text was typically centered and a different typeface and size was preferably used on each line, seemingly intended to exhibit the entire typeface collection of the printing house to the reader rather than facilitate reading (Malmström 1923, 151, 275; Pajatti 1942, 128–30; Kuusela 2004, 29–30). This typographic style period, approximately from 1870 to 1910, is now called the lithographic style, the free style, or the kitsch style. In reviewing the book exhibition at the 1924 literature week, Hellaakoski calls this era "kirjapainojemme tyylitajun rappeutumistilaksi" (Hellaakoski 1924a) [the decadence of style in our printing houses].

Hellaakoski was not the only one with this opinion. The periodical *Graafillinen Aikakauslehti Kirjapainotaito* (1907–1944) [Art of Printing, a Typographic Journal], which set itself the aim of educating staff in the printing trade both technically and aesthetically,

programmatically tried to weed out unnecessary decorations from printed products. Graphic design in the early 1900s can, as Armas Pajatti has suggested (1942), be viewed as a series of purges intended reorient typographic design back on the rails from the excessive decorativeness in which it repeatedly got lost. Sharing design and execution between external illustrator-industrial graphic designers and the printing house staff generated, in a way, two different aesthetic views on the appearance of printed products. The aesthetics of visual artists and industrial graphic designers was image-based or at least based on the interplay between image and word. The printing trade professionals, in particular typesetters, instead relied on the old tradition of letterpress technique and on aesthetics based on book typographic text composition. In practice, the division of tasks could lead, for example, to a situation in which the typographic layout of the text was not at a satisfactory level in a book that had been carefully illustrated by an artist (Syvänne 1916, 178; Vuorio 1925, 260; Nuora 1926; Pajatti 1942, 133–4). At times, typesetters also had to swallow their professional pride and forget their own aesthetic principles when typesetting works that had been designed by external parties (Sälö 1926, 113–4; Pajatti 1942, 110).

Hellaakoski's concept of book art is based on composition-centered aesthetics, which is manifested by the polemic between him and graphic artist Aukusti Tuhka (1895–1973) on the illustration of literary works. With the article "Kirjataiteemme mahdollisuudet" (1945) [The Possibilities of our Book Arts], published in the periodical *Suomalainen Suomi* [Finnish Finland], Tuhka aimed at improving the employment opportunities for graphic artists. Hellaakoski had nothing against the employment of graphic artists. However, he could not accept Tuhka's definition, according to which book decoration with the means of typography was merely industrial graphic design, whereas actual book art was the work "johon luova kuvaamataiteilija

on osallistunut puhtaasti kirjan sisäisen hengen elävöittämiseen tähtäävillä kuvitussuunnitelmillaan ja siihen liittyvin kuvasomistuksin" (Tuhka 1945, 46) [in which a creative visual artist has participated with illustration designs that purely aim at giving life to the book's inner spirit, as well as with related image decorations]. According to Hellaakoski, book arts referred precisely to typographic art, which was executed in the composing room and not in the artist's studio:

> Paras esteettinen ratkaisu täytyy löytyä typografiselta linjalta. Kirjojen painannassa on laiminlyöntiä ja hutilointia enimmän tapahtunut. Sitä mukaa kuin ladonta käsityöstä vaihtui konetyöksi, sitä mukaa kirjojen painoasu on laskemistaan laskenut.… Halukkailla kirjojen 'somistajilla' on kyllä työalaa todellisessa kirjataiteessa, so. työskenneltäessä typografisin keinoin. Tarvitaan aistikkaammat kansilehdet, kauniimmat marginaalien suhteet (= ladelman sovitus sivuaukealle), tyylikkäämmät kirjasimet jne. Taiteilija latomoon! (Hellaakoski 1945, 134)

> (The best aesthetic solution must be found in typography. In printing books, neglecting and bungling have been most common. Simultaneously, as typesetting has shifted from manual work to machine work, the typography of books has been constantly deteriorating.… The keen book "decorators" do have enough work in true book arts, that is, working with typographic means. There is a need for more gracious covers, more beautiful marginal proportions (= placing the composition on the page spread), more elegant typefaces, and so on. Bring the artist to the composing room!)

In addition to traditional composition-centered aesthetics, Hellaakoski's idea of book arts is based on the concept of "purity of form," which is characteristic of his aesthetics at a more general level. In "Kubismista klassisismiin," Hellaakoski examines the development of the expressionist form principle, particularly in cubism. He finds that in cubism the form principle was developed to an extreme, sometimes even to excess:

> Picasso ja Braque, joilla tuossa 1910–12 vaiheilla oli mitä hienoimmat plastilliset tyyliainekset hallussaan, jatkoivat keksinnöitään ilmeisellä tarkoituksella keksiä tyyliparadokseja—kubismin teoreetikot alkoivat useasti käyttää juuri sanaa paradoksi, joka heidän mielestään merkitsi uutta yllättävää totuutta. Maalauksen kannalta siedettävä näistä "totuuksista" oli sellainen yritys pyrkiä abstraktisesta rakentelusta konkreettiseen esineeseen, että esine kuvattiin joka puolelta. Picasso ja Braque käyttivät etenkin soittokoneita (viuluja, mandoliineja) ym. Aiheinaan sillä tapaa että yhden taulun rakennusosasina nähtiin saman esineen eri puolelta poimittuja pintayhdistelmiä.… Tällöin he kuitenkin vielä suorittivat maalauksen maalauksellisilla keinoilla, so. siveltimellä ja värillä. Mutta lopulta he saattoivat niin karkeasti hairahtua pois maalauksesta, että he, esineen ehdotonta ominaisväriä tavoitellessaan, siirsivät kankaalle esineitten väripintoja sellaisinaan. Etenkin Picasson tuotannossa 1913–14 vilisee tauluja, joihin on liimattu painettuja kirjaimia, sanomalehden palasia, tapettisuikaleita, pullojen etikettejä, vahakangasta, lasipaperia, lasia, sahajauhoa, metallilevyjä, metallilankaa ym. (Hellaakoski 1925, 69–70)
>
> (Picasso and Braque, who around 1910–12 possessed the finest possible plastic style

> elements, continued with their inventions obviously in order to invent stylistic paradoxes—the theoreticians of cubism oftentimes began to use exactly the word "paradox," which for them referred to a new, surprising truth. As regards painting, tolerable among these "truths" was the attempt to move from abstract construction to the concrete object, so that the object was portrayed from each side. Picasso and Braque used, above all, musical instruments (for example, violins and mandolins) as their motifs so that one painting consisted of surface combinations picked from different sides of the same object.… However, at this point they still created the painting through painterly methods, that is, with a paintbrush and color. But finally they could so brutally break away from painting that they, aiming at the absolutely natural color of the object, transferred on canvas some color surfaces of the real objects themselves. Particularly Picasso's production in 1913–14 is full of paintings on which he has glued printed letters, pieces of newspaper, strips of wallpaper, bottle labels, oilcloth, glass paper, glass, sawdust, metal plates, wire, and so on.)

The quotation highlights Hellaakoski's aesthetic view, emphasizing purity of form in the arts and seeing painting precisely as the spreading of colors on canvas or other corresponding surface. The idea of the autonomy of the various art forms was common at the beginning of the 1900s. Purity of form plays a central role in, for instance, the Swedish poet Pär Lagerkvist's (1891–1974) modernist manifesto *Ordkonst och bildkonst* (1913) [*Literary Art and Pictorial Art*, 1991], with which Hellaakoski was likely very familiar, as it was found in his library "ahkerasti luetun näköisenä kappaleena" (Viljanen 1972, 215) [as a copy that looked very thoroughly read]. According to Lagerkvist, purity of form is a characteristic of modernistic painting. It is manifested by the efforts of both expressionism and cubism to purify painting of all the alien

elements that distract composition and the artist's imagination. This aim was part of the specialization trend in all fields of society at the time of Lagerkvist's writing, which in his view had been acknowledged to yield the best results, as it allows everyone to concentrate on developing his or her own field (Lagerkvist 1913, 24–5).

One of Finland's main theoreticians of artistic purity of form was architect Sigurd Frosterus (1876–1956). In line with Lagerkvist, he believed that each art form must be developed based on its own means of expression. Painting was to be painting, architecture to be architecture, and poetry purely poetry (Sarje 2000, 78–82). Frosterus thoroughly clarifies the idea of pure painting in his essay collection *Regnbågsfärgernas segertåg* (1917) [The Triumph of Rainbow Colors]. In this collection he suggests that painting was developing both negatively and positively in relation to the other forms of art. Positive development is that which addresses the means of expression and the forms that are typical of painting, and in which its sister art forms do not technically succeed. Negative development involves the avoidance of such motifs and ideas that can be better implemented in other forms of art (Frosterus 1917, 54; Sarje 2000, 79).

In the same way as Lagerkvist and Frosterus, Hellaakoski considers that artistic techniques have their own methodologies, which define their identity and in whose context individual works of art obtain their meanings as representatives of their own art form. A cubist collage to which an artist glues different objects or pieces of objects as parts of the painting questions the conventional idea of art forms. In this respect, the collage approaches—or may even surpass—the limits of serious art. This concept of purity of form is an essential part of Hellaakoski's aesthetics and also informs his concept of book arts. Painting relies on spreading paint on canvas, whereas book arts rely on typography. Book illustration involves the integration of art forms, or at least the blurring of their boundaries, similar to a collage in which means of painting other than the

traditional ones are used:

> Otettakoon puhdasverinen esimerkki kirjakoristelusta. Sellaista edustaa kirja, joka on kaunistettu yksinomaan typograafisin keinoin. Sellainen kauneus kuulu jo sinänsä kirjaan, joka on kirjapainotuote. Ja koska se on yhteensidottu ja kansilla varustettu teos, on sen ulkoasun tähtäävä yhteen ainoaan päämäärään: kirjaan painettuna teoksena. Ulkoasu on teos sinänsä jos sen kirjasimet, paperin koko, ladonnan suhteet, nimilehti, kansi jos kaikki tuo on yhtä kokonaisuutta, yhtä kiteytymää.—Kirjassa voi olla kaksi eri teosta: sisältö ja ulkoasu. Tietysti on parasta jos ne molemmat ovat sopusoinnussa keskenään, edustaen molempien yhteyttä. Mutta ne voivat myöskin kuulua aivan eri maailmoihin, häiritsemättä toisiaan. Pääasia on että ne kumpikin tavallaan ovat kauniita; silloin ne tehostavat toisiaan. Kauneus on yksi, vaikka sen muodot ovat monet! Ja typograafinen kauneus on luonteeltaan ikäänkuin abstraktista, se ei hituistakaan kahlehdi lukijan mielikuvitusta eikä sido niitä aistimuksia, joita hän on tekstistä saanut. Typograafinen kauneus siis sekä kuuluu kirjaan painettuna teoksena että sopii kaunokirjallisen teoksen luonteeseen: se pitää lukijan kauneusvaistot valveilla ja alttiina tekstille. (Hellaakoski 1923a)

> (Let us take a full-blooded example of book decoration: a book that has been embellished using exclusively typographic means. Such beauty in itself belongs in a book, which is a printed product. And because it is a bound work equipped with covers, its appearance is to have only one goal: a book as a printed product. The layout is a work in itself if its typefaces, paper size, the proportions of composition, title page, cover—if all these elements form one entity, one crystallization.—A book may consist of two different

works: content and appearance. Of course, it is ideal if they are in harmony with each other, representing the context of both. However, they can also belong to totally different worlds, without disturbing each other. The main thing is that both of them are beautiful in their own way; that is how they enhance each other. Beauty is one, even though its forms are many! And typographic beauty is somehow abstract in nature; it does not at all chain the readers' imagination or tie the sensations they have received from the text. Typographic beauty is thus a dimension of books as printed products and suits the nature of literary works: it keeps the readers' sense of beauty awake and responsive to the text.)

The experimental typography of *Jääpeili*

Hellaakoski's poetry collection *Jääpeili,* published in 1928, has achieved the status of a classic in the history of Finnish literature. In the 1910s and 1920s, such Swedish-speaking Finnish poets as Edith Södergran (1892–1923), Elmer Diktonius (1896–1961), and Rabbe Enckell (1903–1974) were in the vanguard of modern Scandinavian poetry. Hellaakoski has been placed alongside them as the only Finnish-speaking poet precisely because of *Jääpeili* (Laitinen 1997, 389; Envall 1998, 154–5; Herzberg, Haapala, and Kantola 2013, 445–59). However, toward the end of the 1920s, the Finnish-speaking debate on modernism was dominated by a writer group called Tulenkantajat. This group consisted of young poets who openly attacked the older generation of writers and their literary values. The merits of Tulenkantajat were eventually not particularly notable in modern poetry, and the group's significance is primarily based on the presentation of modernist trends and phenomena. Modernism is visible in the group members' poetry mainly at the content level as a romantic idealization of modern technology—for instance, cars, express

trains, airplanes, neon lights—and as an optimistic orientation to the future (Envall 1998, 157; Herzberg, Haapala, and Kantola 2013, 456–7).

Hellaakoski was one of the few mid-generation writers who in the 1910s had adopted expressionism in Finnish literature (Lassila 1987, 75, 109). In public he tried to keep away from the polemic between the old and the young generation. Nevertheless, Hellaakoski once defended the Tulenkantajat group against the attacks of another mid-generation writer, Viljo Kojo (1891–1966) (Hellaakoski 1929a). Hellaakoski's attitude toward the young poets was not, however, entirely positive. Some of the poems in *Jääpeili,* and particularly a few unpublished poems in the book's manuscript, are targeted at Tulenkantajat and their naïve and superficial idea of modernism. Hellaakoski found the modernism of Tulenkantajat members—who were charmed by the surface phenomena of technology and urban life—strange, and parodied it in some of the poems of *Jääpeili*. In Tulenkantajat poetry, an express train typically plunges toward the metropolises of the modern world, whereas in Hellaakoski's poem "Keväinen junamatka" [Train Ride in the Spring] the train is crawling to the country, away from the city. The same complex relationship with modernism is present in the form language of *Jääpeili*, which integrates old and new elements. Hellaakoski utilizes various tools common in avant-garde poetry, such as free verse, colloquial expressions, parallel verses, onomatopoeia, non-punctuation, omission of capital letters and experimental typography, yet does so without abandoning the traditional poetic tools of expression such as meter and rhymes.

The integration of old and new is also present in the experimental typography of *Jääpeili*. The various typographic tools used by Hellaakoski can be summarized in two categories based on their technical implementation. The first category includes the choice of typefaces and sizes. The second category is based on the use of white space on the page, and it can be divided

into two subcategories: horizontal and vertical. The former is related to the utilization of space, such as indenting and spacing, and the latter to the blank lines between the verses.

Most interesting from the perspective of experimental typography in *Jääpeili* is probably the fact that in each of the work's four sections, the body text was typeset in a different typeface. To my knowledge, this is quite a unique solution. The first section was typeset in sans serif, the second section in Roman, the third is italic Roman, and the last section Fraktur. Certain stanzas were set in italics and smaller type size for typographic contrast. In the third section, in which the body text itself is in italics, typographic contrast was created using Roman type. The appearance of the typefaces, as well as their cultural connotations, support the themes of the sections in *Jääpeili*. The typefaces chosen for the work represent the basic categories of letter forms, but they also bear reference to the recurring typographic debate that went on in Finland from the late 1840s to early 1930s. The use of a sans serif typeface was an uncommon solution in the 1920s, as it was normally used exclusively in job printing, for example, in advertisements. Sans serif typefaces did not become common until the early 1930s, after the adoption of the so-called "new typography" in Finland (Pajatti 1942, 112–28; Itkonen 2012, 34–9). At the beginning of the 1920s, Fraktur was still as popular as Roman type. Replacing Fraktur with Roman type had been discussed in Finland since the late 1840s. Just as the Germans did, many Finns regarded Fraktur as a national typeface. The supporters of Roman found Fraktur to be unclear and outdated. Roman was associated with academic texts written in foreign languages. It had an upper-class status compared to Fraktur, which was used in printing texts intended for the lower strata, such as religious literature. By the end of the 1920s, Fraktur was gradually given up (Jäntti 1940, 431–32; Gardberg 1973, 464–6; Havu 1988, 129). The parallel use of sans serif, Fraktur, and Roman type in *Jääpeili* reflects its more general theme of mixing the old and the new, the

modern and the traditional, manifested at the levels of form and content.

In the experimental typography of *Jääpeili*, Hellaakoski adheres to his more general aesthetic concept that cherishes purity of form and the most typical means of expression in each art form. Even though typographic means are used unconventionally in *Jääpeili*, they are never contrary to the nature of the art of printing. By setting the body text of each section of the work in different typefaces from different stylistic periods and even mixing some these typefaces within the text of the poems, Hellaakoski clearly defied the contemporary typographical trend called "yksstiilisyys" (one-style, or single-style) that promoted stylistic purity. Nevertheless, Hellaakoski respected the formal or technical constraints of typography. For example, Hellaakoski never requested the text to be typeset in an arch or other forms, which would be contrary to the quadrangular nature of type pieces and other typographic tools (Malmström 1923, 581; Hendell and Vuorio 1942, 135; Pajatti 1942, 109; Drucker 2009, 43). In this respect, the typographic poetics of *Jääpeili* essentially differ from, for example, the visual poetry of F. T. Marinetti and Guillaume Apollinaire. Marinetti and Apollinaire often felt traditional book typography to be a tool that restricts expression, which is why they sometimes resorted to photogravure: Marinetti in order to create multilayer collages that integrate image and word, Apollinaire to reproduce his handwritten calligrams (Cundy 1981, 350; Bohn 1986, 50, 62–4; White 1990, 128–9; Drucker 1994, 118, 137–8, 153). The experimental typography of *Jääpeili* is actually more related to the visual poetry of such writers as Stéphane Mallarmé and Ilya Zdanevich, who also stick to book typography (Drucker 1994, 176; 2009, 43–4).

The application of pure typography to visual poetry requires knowledge of the printing process. In exploring the manuscripts and proofs of *Jääpeili*, one becomes convinced that Hellaakoski had this knowledge. Let us take the manuscript of the poem "Sade" (Rain) as an

example here (Figure 1).[4] Instead of being typed, it has been written by hand, which obviously is in no way uncommon among visual poets (Bohn 1986, 3). Furthermore, Hellaakoski has not tried to imitate the appearance of typefaces and sizes iconically but instead has circled with a pencil each part that needs a typographic contrast and marked them in compliance with typographic conventions. In the group of the first diagonally typeset lines and in the last line of the poem ("soi soi soi" [sounds sounds sounds]), the type size has been marked with the abbreviation "nonp.", referring to 6-point nonpareil type size. Higher on the right-hand side, the word "soi" is marked with "kapit.", referring to small capitals. At the end of the poem, "kurs" in the vertically typeset lines refers to italic typeset. The use of blank space on the page cannot be expressed symbolically in the same way. The iconic model of the manuscript is only suggestive; it is bound to change when the text is moved from the manuscript to a printed page. Hellaakoski actually worked on the blank space of the page only at the proofing phase, which gives a better idea of what the text will finally look like.

The look of most of the poems in *Jääpeili* is rather ordinary. The typographic experimentations are at their boldest in the poems "Sade," "Dolce far niente" [Pleasant Idleness], and "Kesien kesä" [The Summer of Summers].[5] They include the widest variety of typefaces, sizes, and blank space. For example, in the poem "Sade," we can see a clear connection to Apollinaire's poem "Il pleut" [It's Raining]—not just because of the title but also because of the diagonally printed letters to suggest rain (Figure 2). In "Sade," just like in many other poems of the *Jääpeili* collection, the interaction of senses plays a central role. The poem depicts how "akkunan valkea silmä / himmenee" [the white eye of the window / dims] as the cloudburst unexpectedly arrives. At the same time, the rain fills the gulf on the street with different sounds.

[4] The manuscript of "Sade" is deposited in the Literary Archives of the Finnish Literature Society, SKS.
[5] Pulkkinen (2013; 2014).

The words “kohista” [swish] and “läiskyä” [splash] are onomatopoetic expressions that bring to mind the rain pouring on a tin roof and water bursting along gutters, as well as the sound of “juoksevain askelten” [running steps] along the street covered with water. The generous repetition of the word “soi” emphasizes the musical nature of the experience.

<INSERT FIGURES 1 & 2 NEAR HERE>

The issue at hand is sensory substitution, in which the rain makes us sense the gulf on the street with our hearing instead of with our sight. “Sade” is thus referring metapoetically to itself as a visual poem. In a rare reference of a couple of sentences to the typography of *Jääpeili*, Hellaakoski himself has noted that while writing the work, he was dreaming about “kokonaan uudesta tyylistä, joka käyttäisi hyväkseen painoasunkin teknillisiä mahdollisuuksia, saadakseen sielunilmeen kiinni sanaan. Onhan runo nykyisin painotuote. Miksei se jo syntyessään ajattelisi typografista muotoansa!” (Hellaakoski 1964, 61, 63) [a whole new style that would also utilize the technical possibilities of typography in order to fix the state of mind to the word. Today, the poem is indeed a printed product. Why wouldn’t it think about its typographic form already from it’s birth!] Both sound and appearance are thus forms of expression in poetry, and they intertwine. In “Sade,” sounds play a significant role particularly in the onomatopoetic expressions, the repetitions, and the rhythm. But the typography of the poem also has iconic features, above all, in the vertically typeset lines that portray rain and when the poem text becomes narrower “kadun ahtaassa kuilussa” [in the narrow gulf of the street].

Hellaakoski’s idea of poems as art for the ear as well as for the eye must not be confused with the avant-garde effort to cross the boundaries of the various arts. Unlike such poets

as Marinetti or Apollinaire, whose visual poetry questioned the division between literary and visual arts, Hellaakoski rather highlights the purity of form in poetry. It would be against the essence of poetry to ignore its visual dimension, which today defines it as a printed product. However, the visual nature of poetry is not similar to the visual nature of painting—it is related to the visual dimension of printed text, that is, expressive typography. Iconic typography does thus not refer to a mimetic relationship with the content of the poem, but it produces content simultaneously as part of the poem as a whole and in interaction with the content and auditory material.

As a conclusion, we can state that the writings on book arts not yet heeded in research on Hellaakoski significantly clarify his general aesthetic thinking, in which the concept of purity of form plays an essential role. The surprisingly strict opposition to the illustration of literary works highlighted in these writings may at first seem to be in conflict with the fact that Hellaakoski himself published the *Jääpeili* collection, which includes visual poetry. However, a closer examination of the work's typography shows that Hellaakoski follows the principle of pure typography in it, which is part of his book arts concept. So, Hellaakoski applies his general aesthetic principles—based on the purity of form—also in practice through the typographic poetics of *Jääpeili*.[6]

Works cited

[6] This work was supported by the Academy of Finland (project number 251025); the Finnish Cultural Foundation (grant number 00110730); and the Finnish Literature Society, SKS.

Bassy, Alain-Marie. 1973–1974. “Forme littéraire et forme graphique: les schématogrammes d’Apollinaire.” *Scolies: Cahiers de recherche de l’école normal supérieure* 3–4: 161–207.

Bohn, Willard. 1986. *The Aesthetics of Visual Poetry 1914–1928*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bornstein, George. 1998. “Yates and Textual Reincarnation: ‘When You Are Old’ and ‘September 1913’.” In *The Iconic Page in Manuscript, Print, and Digital Culture*, edited by Georg Bornstein and Theresa Tinkle, 223–48. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Cundy, David. 1981. “Marinetti and Italian Futurist Typography.” *Art Journal* 41: 349–52.

Drucker, Johanna. 1994. *The Visible Word: Experimental Typography and Modern Art, 1909–1923*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

———. 2009. “Book Production of Russian-Avant-Garde Books 1912–1916.” *Journal of Artists Books* 26: 39–45.

Frosterus, Sigurd. 1917. *Regnbågsfärgernas segertåg*. Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag and Helsinki: Holger Schildts Förlag.

Gallen-Kallela, Akseli. 1909. “Kansallis-kirjokirjaksi ehdoitettu kuvitettu Kalevala.” *Valvoja* 2: 217–8.

Gardberg, Karl-Rudolf. 1973. *Turun Palosta vuoteen 1918.* Vol. 3 of *Kirjapainotaito Suomessa.* Translated by Eino Nivanka. Helsinki: Helsingin Graafillinen Klubi.

Goddard, Linda. 2006. “Mallarmé, Picasso and the Aesthetic of the Newspaper.” *Word and Image* 22: 293–303.

Havu, Sirkka. 1988. “Suomalaisen kirjan tyylihistoriaa.” In *Kirja Suomessa: Kirjan juhlavuoden näyttely Kansallismuseossa 25.8.–31.12.1988*, edited by Esko Häkli, 119–36. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston kirjasto.

Hellaakoski, Aaro. 1916. *Runoja*. Helsinki: Otava.

———. 1917a. “Kalevalaa kuvittamaanko?” *Ylioppilaslehti* 3: 34–6.

———. 1917b. “Kysymys Kalevalan kuvittamisesta.” *Ylioppilaslehti* 4: 59–60.

———. 1917c. “Akseli Gallen aikoo kuvittaa Kalevalan.” *Ylioppilaslehti* 6: 70–2.

———. 1920. “Kansallinen, upea-asuinen koruteos.” *Karjalan Aamulehti*, November 14.

———. 1921a. “Kirjojen kansilehdistä.” *Aika*: 100–2.

———. 1921b. *T. K. Sallinen*. Hämeenlinna: Karisto.

———. 1923a. “Kirjojen ulkoasusta ja koristamisesta.” *Iltalehti*, March 5.

———. 1923b. “Nummisuutarit uudessa painoasussa.” *Iltalehti*, October 10.

———. 1924a. “Kirjanäyttelyitä.” *Iltalehti*, November 5.

———. 1924b. “Eino Leino: Helkavirsiä.” *Iltalehti*, December 11.

———. 1925. “Kubismista klassisismiin.” In *Taiteilijaseuran joulualbumi*, edited by Ludvig Wennerström, 61–77. Helsinki: Suomen Taiteilijaseura.

———. 1927. *Iloinen yllätys.* Helsinki: Otava.

———. 1928. *Jääpeili*. Helsinki: Otava.

———. 1929a. “Tulenkantajat—harvinaisen solidaarinen ryhmä tässä kateuden maassa.” *Aitta* 6: 30–2.

———. 1929b. “Lentopostia.” *Aitta* 10: 16–7.

———. 1929c. “Aitan toimitukselle.” *Aitta* 11: 54.

———. 1945. “Kirjojen kuvittamisesta.” *Suomalainen Suomi* 2: 133–4.

———. 1950. *Kuuntelua: Esseitä teoksista ja tekijöistä*. Helsinki: WSOY.

———. 1964. *Runon historiaa*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Hendell, Lauri, and V. A. Vuorio. 1942. *Kirja ja kirjapainotaito*. Helsinki: Otava.

Honkanen, Helmiriitta. 1983. *Placatista julisteeksi: Suomalaisen julistetaiteen historiaa kirjapainotaidon alusta vuoteen 1960*. Helsinki: Otava.

Itkonen, Markus. 2012. *Kadonneet kirjaintyypit: Suomalainen kirjainmuotoilu 1920–1985*. Helsinki: RPS-yhtiöt.

Jankeviciute, Giedre and Mikas Vaicekauskas. 2013. "An Omnipotent Tradition: The Illustrations of Kristijonas Donelaitis's Poem Metai and the Creation of a Visual Canon." *Variants* 10: 211–34.

Jäntti, Yrjö A. 1940. *Kirjapainotaidon historia*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Kelen, Sarah A. 2001. "Peirs Plouhman [sic] and the 'formidable array of blackletter' in the Early Nineteenth Century." In *Illuminating Letters: Typography and Literary Interpretation*, edited by Paul C. Gutjahr and Megan L. Benton, 47–67. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

Kivi, Aleksis. 1923. *Nummisuutarit: komedia viidessä näytöksessä.* Book design by Toivo Vikstedt. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

Kasinec, Edward and Robert Davis. 1989. "Russian Book Arts on the Eve of World War One: The New York Public Library Collections." *The Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts* 14: 94–111.

Kuusela, Tuija. 2004. *Taiteilijat kirjaimia piirtämässä: Suomen kultakauden kirjataidetta*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Lagerkvist, Pär. 1913. *Ordkonst och bildkonst*. Stockholm: Bröderna Lagerström.

Laitinen, Kai. 1997. *Suomen kirjallisuuden historia*. Helsinki: Otava.

Lapacherie, Jean-Gérard. 1994. "Typographic Characters: Tension Between Text and Drawing." Translated by Anna Lehmann. *Yale French Studies* 84: 63–77.

Lassila, Pertti. 1987. *Uuden aikakauden runous: ekspressionistinen tematiikka 1910- ja 1920-luvun suomenkielisessä lyriikassa*. Helsinki: Otava.

Lauri [Paavolainen], Olavi and Mika Waltari. 1928. *Valtatiet*. Helsinki: Otava.

Lauri H–èn. 1917. "Kalevalaa kuvittamaan." *Ylioppilaslehti* 4: 47–8.

Leino, Eino. 1924. *Helkavirsiä*. Illustrated by Kalle Carlstedt. Helsinki: Otava.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. 1887. *Laocoon: An Essay Upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry*. Translated by Ellen Forthingham. Boston: Roberts Brothers.

Liszka, James Jakób. 1996. *A General Introduction to the Semeiotic of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Malmström, K. 1923. *Kirjapainotaidon oppikirja, latomis-osa*. Helsinki: Otava.

Mikkonen, Kai. 2005. *Kuva ja sana: Kuvan ja sanan vuorovaikutus kirjallisuudessa, kuvataiteessa ja ikonoteksteissä*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Mitchell, W. J. T. 1994. *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mäkinen, Marketta. 1995. *Kalle Carlstedtin puupiirrostaide: uudistuspyrkimyksistä kansallisen taiteen vainiolle*. Licentiate thesis in art history. University of Jyväskylä.

Nuora, Atto. 1926. "Taiteilijat ja kirjapainotyön ulkoasu." *Kirjapainotaito* 2: 31–2.

Pajatti, Armas. 1942. "Painotuotantomme ulkoasun vaiheita vuosisatamme aikana." In *Suomen kirjapainotaidon historiaa 1900–1942,* edited by Einari Teräskivi and Olavi Suominen, 93–148. Helsinki: Helsingin Graafillinen Klubi.

Perälä, Anna. 2014. “Taide ja kirja: välähdyksiä”. *Bibliophilos* 2: 12–19.

Pulkkinen, Veijo. 2013. “A Genetic and Semiotic Approach to the Bibliographical Code Exemplified by the Typography of Aaro Hellaakoski’s ‘Dolce far Niente’.” *Variants* 10, *The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship*: 163–86.

———. 2014. “‘Why Would It Not Think of Its Typographic Form Already from Its Birth!’: A Genetic Approach to the Typography of Aaro Hellaakoski’s ‘Kesien kesä’.” *Word & Image: A Journal of Verbal/Visual Enquiry* 30 (4): 377–87.

Sadik-Ogli, Nikolai. 2000. “Bloody Might: Dada in Finland in the 1920s.” *The Journal of Finnish Studies* 4 (1): 37–51.

Salmelainen, Eero, ed. 1920. *Suomen kansan satuja ja tarinoita*. Illustrated by Josef Alanen et al. Helsinki: Kirja.

Sarje, Kimmo. 2000. “Sigurd Frosteruksen modernin käsite: Maailmankatsomus ja arkkitehtuuri.” *Dimensio* 3: 78–82.

Smolander, Anja. 1971. *Topi Vikstedt kirjataiteilijana.* Master’s thesis, University of Helsinki.

———. 1974. “Nummisuutarien kuvitus—Topi Vikstedtin päätyö.” *Bibliophilos* 2: 35–40.

Syvänne, Atte. 1916. “Kirjojemme asu, taide ja työ.” *Kirjapainotaito* 12: 177–81.

Sälö. 1926. “Onko taiteilijat asetettava ammattimiehen yläpuolelle?” *Kirjapainotaito* 5: 113–4.

Tiusanen, Timo. 1977. *Linjoja: Tutkielmia kirjallisuudesta ja teatterista*. Helsinki: Otava.

Tuhka, Aukusti. 1945. *Kirjataiteemme mahdollisuudet. Suomalainen Suomi* 1: 46–8.

Viljanen, Aulimaija. 1972. “Nykyaikaa etsimässä Apollinairesta Paavolaiseen.” *Kirjallisuudentutkijain seuran vuosikirja* 26: 210–20.

Vuorio, A. 1925. “Kirjapainollisista tyylivirtauksista muualla ja meillä.” *Kirjapainotaito* 12: 253–60.

White, John J. 1990. *Literary Futurism: Aspects of the First Avant Garde*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.